(Proposed changes to the Environmental Checklist presented on August 26, 2005 are shown in ~~strikeout~~ for deletions and underline for additions)

ATTACHMENT C
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

I. BACKGROUND

1. **Project title:** *Basin Plan amendment to incorporate Nutrient TMDLs for Big Bear Lake in the Big Bear Lake Watershed*

2. **Lead agency name and address:** *California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Santa Ana Region, 3737 Main Street, Suite 500, Riverside, CA 92501-3348*

3. **Contact person and phone number:** *Hope Smythe (951) 782- 4493*

4. **Project location:** *Big Bear Lake Watershed, San Bernardino County (all portions of the City of Big Bear Lake)*

5. **Project sponsor's name and address:** *California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Santa Ana Region, 3737 Main Street, Suite 500, Riverside, CA 92501-3348*

6. **General plan designation:** *Not applicable*

7. **Zoning:** *Not applicable*

8. **Description of project:** *Adoption of a Basin Plan amendment to incorporate Nutrient TMDLs for Big Bear Lake. The TMDLs establish wasteload allocations and load allocations for allowable nutrient inputs by all identified sources that discharge to Big Bear Lake. The intent is to achieve numeric, water quality targets that will protect the beneficial uses of the lake. The Basin Plan amendment includes an implementation plan that details the actions required by the Regional Board and other dischargers ~~responsible parties~~ responsible for implementing the TMDLs.*

9. **Surrounding land uses and setting:** *Not applicable*

10. **Other public agencies whose approval is required:** *The Basin Plan amendment must be approved by the State Water Resources Control Board, the Office of Administrative Law, and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency before it becomes effective.*

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:
The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

☐ Aesthetics	☐ Agricultural Resources	☐ Air Quality
☐ Biological Resources	☐ Cultural Resources	☐ Geology/Soils
☐ Hazards & Hazardous Materials	☐ Hydrology / Water Quality	☐ Land Use / Planning
☐ Mineral Resources	☐ Noise	☐ Population / Housing
☐ Public Services	☐ Recreation	☐ Transportation / Traffic
☐ Utilities / Service Systems	☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance	

II. DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

~~X~~ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment.

__X__ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment. However, there are feasible alternatives and/or mitigation measures available that will substantially lessen any adverse impact. These alternatives are discussed in the attached written report.

____ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment. There are no feasible alternatives and/or feasible mitigation measures available that would substantially lessen any significant adverse impact. See the attached written report for a discussion of this determination.

_____ _____
Signature Date

Hope Smythe
Senior Environmental Scientist~~pecialist~~

III. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

CEQA Checklist

Question	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS - Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			X	
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?			X	~~X~~
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?			X	~~X~~
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				X
II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				X
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?				X
III. AIR QUALITY - Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				X
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			X	~~X~~
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient			X	~~X~~

CEQA Checklist

Question	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?				
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X	~~X~~
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?		X		~~X~~
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES - Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		X	~~X~~	
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?		X	~~X~~	
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?			X	~~X~~
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?		X	~~X~~	
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				X
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §~~¤~~15064.5?				X
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §~~¤~~15064.5?				X
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				X

CEQA Checklist

Question	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				X
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS - Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				X
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				X
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?				X
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				X
iv) Landslides?				X
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				X
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on-site or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?				X
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?				X
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				X
VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS - Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?		X		~~X~~
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?		X		~~X~~
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X

CEQA Checklist

Question	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				X
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?		X		~~X~~
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				X
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on-site or off-site?				X
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on-site or off-site?				X
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				X
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			X	~~X~~
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X

CEQA Checklist

Question	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				X
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?			X	~~X~~
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?				X
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				X
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X
X. MINERAL RESOURCES - Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				X
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				X
XI. NOISE - Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?		X		~~X~~
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?		X		~~X~~
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	~~X~~
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?		X	~~X~~	
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people			X	~~X~~

CEQA Checklist

Question	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?			X	~~X~~
XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING - Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				X
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES				
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: Fire protection? Police protection? Schools? Parks? Other public facilities?				X
XIV. RECREATION - Would the project**:**				
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				X
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				X
XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC - Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?			X	

CEQA Checklist

Question	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?			X	~~X~~
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				X
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?				X
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?				X
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				X
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				X
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			~~X~~	X
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				X
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				X
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				X
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X
XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE -				

CEQA Checklist

Question	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?		X		~~X~~
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ('Cumulatively considerable' means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?			X	~~X~~
c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		X		~~X~~

Attachment - Environmental Checklist

Discussion of Environmental Impacts

Explanation of Environmental Checklist "Less than significant with mitigation incorporation" Answers

Note: Adoption of the Basin Plan amendment to incorporate Nutrient TMDLs for Big Bear Lake will not have any direct adverse impact on the environment. Implementation of actions necessary to achieve the TMDLs may affect the environment, as described below. However, the intent of TMDL implementation is to restore and protect the water quality of the lake and its beneficial uses. Any potential adverse environmental effects associated with TMDL implementation will be subject to project-specific CEQA analysis and certification to assure appropriate avoidance/minimization and mitigation.

III. Air Quality (e)

The proposed TMDLs call for actions to reduce internal nutrient loading to the lake, which may include sediment removal, fishery management, macrophyte management, the application of aluminum sulfate (alum) or other mechanisms. Sediment removal may result in the excavation of lake bottom material and the storage of the material near the lake for drying. Without incorporation of mitigation measures, the top few inches of the sediment may contain organic material that may cause objectionable odors; fishery management also might result in potential objectionable odors if fish are removed and then not disposed of properly after their removal; and removal of macrophytes and subsequent disposition of macrophytes might also cause potential objectionable odors.

Possible mitigation measures to reduce these impacts to less than significant:
Coverage of potential odiferous materials to control odors from materials that are stored on site; expeditious removal of odiferous materials; proper storage of removed fish (i.e., freeze) until they can be removed from the site.

Any of these proposed implementation actions would be subject to specific CEQA analysis and certification.

IV. Biological Resources (a), (b), (d)

The proposed TMDLs call for actions to reduce internal nutrient loading to the lake, which may include such activities as the application of aluminum sulfate (alum), fishery management, macrophyte management, sediment removal and aeration. The Big Bear Lake watershed is host to many sensitive species, including the Federally-threatened Bald Eagle as well as riparian and sensitive habitats. Without incorporation of mitigation measures, implementation of in-lake remediation measures has the potential to impact riparian or sensitive habitat and nesting birds, alter suitable wintering waterfowl habitat, have a negative effect on the amount of available forage area for the bald eagle and other nesting and wintering raptors, and affect other wildlife or plant species.

Mitigation measures to reduce these impacts to less than significant:
Conduct the requisite surveys (e.g., biological, botanical, nesting, tree, etc.) for each project, identify suitable alternatives to avoid or minimize any adverse impacts and apply the proper mitigation dependent upon the species and habitat found.

Conduct in-lake remediation or construction activities outside of the known bald eagle wintering period (December through March) and any other known nesting, wintering or breeding period for observed candidate, sensitive or special status species.

VII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials (a), (b)

The proposed TMDLs call for actions to reduce internal nutrient loading to the lake, which may include such activities as the application of aluminum sulfate (alum), fishery management, macrophyte management, sediment removal and aeration. PCBs and other organics as well as mercury have been observed in some fish tissue samples but to date have not been observed in lake sediments. Without incorporation of mitigation measures, implementation of in-lake remediation measures could potentially cause the release of these pollutants to the local environment; disposal of contaminated sediments could pose a human health hazard during transport, following an accident condition and would have to be disposed of in a landfill that accepts hazardous materials.

Potential mitigation measures to reduce these impacts to less than significant:
Analyze sediments to be dredged for possible pollutants for each project. Identify and implement appropriate BMPs and possible avoidance/remediation alternatives.
Implement BMPs to the maximum extent practicable to mitigate project-specific impacts.

VII. Hydrology and Water Quality (a)

The proposed TMDLs call for actions to reduce internal nutrient loading to the lake, which may include such activities as the application of aluminum sulfate (alum), fishery management, macrophyte management, sediment removal and aeration. Without incorporation of mitigation measures, implementation of the in-lake remediation measures has the potential to exceed Basin Plan objectives for several constituents (pH, turbidity, dissolved oxygen, etc.), cause the short-term release of nutrients, metals, and organics which might exceed Basin Plan objectives and cause impacts to the beneficial uses of the lake (i.e., RARE, COLD, WARM, REC1, REC2, and WILD).

The application of alum in Big Bear Lake is problematic in that background aluminum concentrations in the lake exceed EPA's recommended aluminum criteria for the protection of freshwater aquatic life. Alum application could cause or contribute to further violations of this criterion. The development of a site-specific objective for aluminum appears to be warranted.

Potential mitigation measures to reduce these impacts to less than significant:
If alum application is authorized pursuant to waste discharge requirements, implement BMPs, monitor dosage rates and methods to assure that established water quality objectives are not violated.
Implement BMPs to the maximum extent practicable to mitigate project-specific impacts and assure that any impacts are limited spatially and/or temporally.

XI. Noise (a), (b), (d)

The proposed TMDLs call for actions to reduce internal nutrient loading to the lake, which may such activities as the application of aluminum sulfate (alum), fishery management, macrophyte management, sediment removal and aeration. The lake is surrounded by residential areas, schools, and businesses. Implementation of the in-lake remediation activities has the potential to cause noise disturbances through the use of heavy-equipment, haul trucks and other equipment. Without incorporation of mitigation measures, in-lake remediation activities could result in significant, though short-term noise impacts to noise sensitive land uses within proximity to the project site.

Potential mitigation measures to reduce these impacts to less than significant:
Ensure that construction equipment is properly maintained and has properly fitted mufflers.
Limit in-lake remediation activities to Monday through Saturday, between the hours of 7:00 A.M. to 7:00 P.M., in compliance with San Bernardino Development Code, Chapter 9, Performance Standards (87.0905).

Explanation of Environmental Checklist "Less than significant" Answers

Note: Adoption of the Basin Plan amendment to incorporate Nutrient TMDLs for Big Bear Lake will not have any direct adverse impact on the environment. Implementation of actions necessary to achieve the TMDLs may affect the environment, as described below. However, the intent of TMDL implementation is to restore and protect the water quality of the lake and its beneficial uses. Any potential adverse environmental effects associated with TMDL implementation will be subject to project-specific CEQA analysis and certification to assure appropriate avoidance/minimization and mitigation.

I. Aesthetics (a), (b), (c)

The proposed TMDLs call for reductions in nutrient loads within~~to~~ the lake, which may include the implementation of BMPs and in-lake remediation measures that are ~~could be~~ aesthetically unpleasing. The aesthetic effect on scenic vistas, scenic resources and the visual character of Big Bear Lake are expected to be limited spatially and/or temporally and are considered less than significant.

III. Air Quality (b), (c), (d)

The proposed TMDLs call for actions to reduce internal nutrient loading to the lake. Some of the in-lake remediation measures may require the use of construction equipment. Use of the construction equipment and construction activities in general, may cause short-term impacts.

IV. Biological Resources (c)

The proposed TMDLs call for actions to reduce internal nutrient loading to the lake, which may include application of aluminum sulfate (alum), macrophyte management and sediment removal. Some of these actions may cause impacts to land that currently supports riparian habitat or sensitive species. Any such actions would be subject to specific CEQA analysis and certification, and would be intended to restore and protect the biological resources of the lake and the Big Bear Lake watershed.

~~**IV. Biological Resources (a), (b), (d)**~~

~~The proposed TMDLs call for actions to reduce internal nutrient loading to the lake, which may include the application of aluminum sulfate (alum), fishery management, macrophyte management and sediment removal. The Big Bear Lake watershed is host to many sensitive species including the Federally-threatened Bald Eagle. Such actions have the potential to affect the biota, including sensitive species. Any such actions are likely to be temporary and in the long-term, would result in the enhancement of Big Bear Lake aquatic habitat utilized by sensitive species.~~

VII. Hydrology and Water Quality (f), (j)

The proposed TMDLs call for reductions in nutrient loads within the lake, which may include the implementation of BMPs and in-lake remediation measures that could result in short-term impacts to water quality as explained above. These effects are expected to be limited spatially and/or temporally. The intent of TMDL implementation is to restore and protect the water quality of the lake and its

beneficial uses. If the TMDLs are not implemented, water quality will remain impaired until the in-lake remediation activities remove or control the sources of nutrients.

XI. Noise (c), (e), (f)~~(d)~~

Implementation of actions necessary to implement the proposed TMDLs may result in increases in noise levels. However, these effects are expected to be limited in scope and duration and are not considered significant. Again, proposed implementation actions would be subject to specific CEQA analysis and certification.

XV. Transportation/Traffic (a), (b)

Implementation of actions necessary to implement the proposed TMDLs, such as transporting alum to Big Bear Lake and/or removal and disposal of dredge materials, may result in increases in traffic on the two main highways that serve Big Bear Lake. However, these effects are expected to be limited in scope and duration and are not considered significant. Again, proposed implementation actions would be subject to specific CEQA analysis and certification.

~~**XVI. Utilities and Service Systems (c)**~~

~~The proposed TMDLs call for reductions in nutrient contributions to the lake from internal sources. To achieve these reductions, modifications to the storm drainage system may be necessary. Any such projects associated with storm drainage systems modifications would be subject to further, case-specific environmental review and certification.~~

XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance

The proposed TMDLs call for actions to reduce internal nutrient loading to the lake, which may include such activities as the application of aluminum sulfate (alum), fishery management, macrophyte management, sediment removal and aeration. Implementation of the in-lake remediation activities has the potential to cause impacts to resources as identified in the checklist. Some of these impacts are considered less than significant, as discussed above. In other instances, the mitigation measures identified in this document along with mitigation measures identified in any subsequent project-specific analyses are expected to ensure that impacts are reduced to a less than significant level.

Implementation of the in-lake remediation activities will not eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

Implementation of the in-lake remediation activities would ultimately result in the long-term improvement in the lake's water quality since the intent of TMDL implementation is to restore and protect the water quality of the lake and its beneficial uses. Short-term impacts from construction activities related to the in-lake remediation activities have the potential to result in impacts to air emissions and noise levels during implementation. With the incorporation of the mitigation measures identified in this document to reduce air emissions and noise levels, along with mitigation measures identified in any subsequent project-specific analysis, the in-lake remediation activities would not result in environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.